

THE LIMITS OF MATHEMATICS (Extended Abstract)

G. J. Chaitin
IBM Research Division
chaitin@watson.ibm.com

In June 1994 I gave a five-day course on the limits of mathematics at the University of Maine in Orono. This course featured a new approach to algorithmic information theory (AIT). Four versions [1]–[4] of the course notes for this course, each using a somewhat different approach, are available. To automatically obtain any one of them in $\text{\LaTeX}$, for example `chao-dyn/9407003`, send e-mail to “`chao-dyn @ xyz.lanl.gov`” with “Subject: get 9407003”.

AIT deals with program-size complexity. I define the complexity $H(X)$ of an object X to be the size in bits of the smallest program that can calculate X . Up to now, to get elegant mathematical properties for this complexity measure $H(X)$, I had to measure the size of programs for an abstract universal Turing machine. This gave the right mathematical properties, but it was not a programming language that anyone could actually use. Now I have found a way to obtain the correct program-size complexity measure of AIT by measuring the

size of programs in a series of powerful and easy to use programming languages. These programming languages are versions of LISP that I have invented expressly for this purpose. Which of these programming languages one considers most natural is to a certain extent a matter of personal taste.

What does AIT have to say concerning the limits of mathematics? My theory yields two fundamental information-theoretic incompleteness theorems. First of all, my theorem, originally going back to 1970, that an N -bit formal axiomatic system cannot enable one to exhibit any specific object X with program-size complexity $H(X)$ greater than $N + c$. Secondly, my theorem, originally going back to 1986, that an N -bit formal axiomatic system cannot enable one to determine more than $N + c'$ scattered bits of the halting probability Ω . In `chao-dyn/9407003`, $c = 2359$ bits and $c' = 7581$ bits. In `chao-dyn/9407005`, $c = 1127$ bits and $c' = 3689$ bits. In `chao-dyn/9407006`, $c = 994$ bits and $c' = 3192$ bits. And in `chao-dyn/9407009`, $c = 735$ bits and $c' = 2933$ bits.

I think I prefer the “aggressive” formulation in `chao-dyn/9407009`. I can also make a case for the “conservative” formulation in `chao-dyn/9407003`. `chao-dyn/9407005` and `chao-dyn/9407006` are the intermediate steps between `chao-dyn/9407003` and `chao-dyn/9407009`.

After the references we summarize `chao-dyn/9407003` in a four-page appendix. The first page is a table summarizing the version of LISP that is used. The second page is an example of a program written in this LISP. The third page summarizes the definitions, and the fourth page summarizes the results.

References

- [1] G. J. Chaitin, “The Limits of Mathematics,” IBM Research Report RC 19646, e-print `chao-dyn/9407003`, July 1994, 270 pp.
- [2] G. J. Chaitin, “The Limits of Mathematics II,” IBM Research Report RC 19660, e-print `chao-dyn/9407005`, July 1994, 255 pp.
- [3] G. J. Chaitin, “The Limits of Mathematics III,” IBM Research Report RC 19663, e-print `chao-dyn/9407006`, July 1994, 239 pp.

- [4] G. J. Chaitin, “The Limits of Mathematics IV,” IBM Research Report RC 19671, e-print [chao-dyn/9407009](#), July 1994, 231 pp.

'	quote	1 arg	'(abc) $\longrightarrow$ (abc)
+	head	1 arg	+'(abc) $\longrightarrow$ a +a $\longrightarrow$ a
-	tail	1 arg	-'(abc) $\longrightarrow$ (bc) -a $\longrightarrow$ a
*	join	2 args	*a'(bc) $\longrightarrow$ (abc) *ab $\longrightarrow$ a
.	atom	1 arg	.a $\longrightarrow$ 1 .'(a) $\longrightarrow$ 0
=	equal	2 args	=aa $\longrightarrow$ 1 =ab $\longrightarrow$ 0
/	if	3 args	/0ab $\longrightarrow$ b /xab $\longrightarrow$ a
&	function	2 args	('&(xy)y ab) $\longrightarrow$ b
,	display	1 arg	,x $\longrightarrow$ x and displays x
!	eval	1 arg	!e $\longrightarrow$ evaluate e
?	try	3 args	?teb $\longrightarrow$ evaluate e time t with bits b $?teb \longrightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c} ! \\ ? \text{ captured} \\ \text{(value)} \text{ displays...} \end{array} \right)$
@	read bit	0 args	@ $\longrightarrow$ 0 or 1
%	read exp	0 args	% $\longrightarrow$ any s-expression
#	bits for	1 arg	#x $\longrightarrow$ bit string for x
^	append	2 args	~'(ab)'(cd) $\longrightarrow$ (abcd)
~	show	1 arg	~x $\longrightarrow$ x and may show x
:	let	3 args	:xv e $\longrightarrow$ ('&(x)e v) :(fx)d e $\longrightarrow$ ('&(f)e '&(x)d)
&	define	2 args	&xv $\longrightarrow$ x is v &(fx)d $\longrightarrow$ f is &(x)d
”	literally	1 arg	”+ $\longrightarrow$ +
{ }	unary		{3} $\longrightarrow$ (111)
[]	comment		[ignored]
()	empty		
0	false		
1	true		

DEFINITIONS

- An S-expression x is elegant if no smaller S-expression has the same output. (Here “output” may be either its value or what it displays.)
- Let x be an S-expression. The LISP complexity $H_L(x)$ of x is the size in characters $|p|$ of the smallest S-expression p whose value is x .
- Let X be an infinite set of S-expressions. The LISP complexity $H_L(X)$ of the infinite set X is the size in characters $|p|$ of the smallest S-expression p that displays the elements of X .
- [U(p) = output of universal machine U]
 [given binary program p.]
 & (Up) ++?0'!%p
- Let x be an S-expression. The complexity $H(x)$ of x is the smallest possible value of 7 times (the size in characters $|p|$ of an S-expression p whose value is x if it is given the binary data d) plus (the size in bits $|d|$ of the binary data d given to p).
- Equivalently $H(x) \equiv H_U(x)$ is the size in bits $|p|$ of the smallest bit string p such that $U(p) = x$.
- The halting probability Ω of U is the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$ of (the number of t -bit programs p such that $U(p)$ halts within time t) divided by 2^t .
- Let X be an infinite set of S-expressions. The complexity $H(X)$ of the infinite set X is the smallest possible value of 7 times (the size in characters $|p|$ of an S-expression p that displays the elements of X if it is given the binary data d) plus (the size in bits $|d|$ of the binary data d given to p).
- Equivalently $H(X) \equiv H_U(X)$ is the size in bits $|p|$ of the smallest bit string p such that $X = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} -?t'!%p$.

RESULTS

- Lowcase variables x, y, n are individual S-expressions.

Uppercase variables X, Y, T are infinite sets of S-expressions.

- $H_L(x, y) \leq H_L(x) + H_L(y) + 8.$

- If $x \in T \implies x$ is elegant, then

$$x \in T \implies |x| \leq H_L(T) + 378.$$

- If $(x, n) \in T \implies H_L(x) \geq n$, then

$$(x, n) \in T \implies n \leq H_L(T) + 381.$$

- $H(x, y) \leq H(x) + H(y) + 140.$

- Let x be a string of $|x|$ bits.

$$H(x) \leq 2|x| + 469, \text{ and } H(x) \leq |x| + H(|x|) + 1148.$$

- Let Ω_n be the first n bits of Ω .

$$H(\Omega_n) > n - 4431.$$

- $H(X \cap Y) \leq H(X) + H(Y) + 4193.$

- $H(X \cup Y) \leq H(X) + H(Y) + 4193.$

- If $(x, n) \in T \implies H(x) \geq n$, then

$$(x, n) \in T \implies n \leq H(T) + 2359.$$

- T cannot determine more than $H(T) + 7581$ bits of Ω .